

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 – 8, 10, and 15 – 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to more specifically define and particularly distinguish the claimed invention. Claims 9 and 23 have been cancelled. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 10 and 15 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Hadad et al., (2003), “Temporal Reasoning for a Collaborative Planning Agent in a Dynamic Environment”,” 37 Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence 331-279 (“Hadad article”).

I. Examiner Interview

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Lin Liu for the courtesies extended in the telephonic interview held on December 10, 2008. An amendment to claim 1 was proposed by Applicant’s attorney and the Hadad article was discussed. Examiner Lui stated that he believed the amendment to the claim overcame the teaching of the Hadad article, but that he would have to give further consideration to the Hadad article.

II. Rejection of Claims 1 – 10 and 15 – 23 (35 U.S.C. 102(a))

The Examiner stated that the Hadad article teaches a method in a computer system for assessing the relative complexity of different options for performing a task by the computer system, the method comprising the steps of: storing programming instructions on a storage medium of the computer system, executing the instructions by the computer system, wherein the executing causes the computer system to implement a method comprising the steps of defining the task as a sequenced set data structure that specifies actions of the task, and sequence information that specifies the order in which particular actions are to be performed; storing

recipes available for performing constituent actions of the task as sequenced set data structures that specify subactions of the recipes for the constituent actions, and sequence information that specifies the order in which the subactions are to be performed; determining complexity measures associated with performing the task using different combinations of recipes for constituent actions of the task, based upon complexity measures of actions specified by respective combinations of available recipes; and presenting a report of the complexity measures associated with performing the task.

The claimed invention is directed to a method in a computer system for assessing the relative complexity of different options for performing a task by the computer system, the method comprising the steps of storing programming instructions on a storage medium of the computer system, executing the instructions by the computer system, wherein the executing causes the computer system to implement a method comprising the steps of defining the task as a sequenced set data structure that specifies actions of the task, and sequence information that specifies the order in which particular actions are to be performed; storing recipes available for performing constituent actions of the task as sequenced set data structures that specify subactions of the recipes for the constituent actions, and sequence information that specifies the order in which the subactions are to be performed; determining complexity measures associated with performing the task using different combinations of recipes for constituent actions of the task, based upon complexity measures of actions specified by respective combinations of available recipes; delegating the defined task to a primary agent for execution of the task by at least one of the primary agent and one or more contracting agents, wherein the complexity of the action is

characterized by mutually exclusive measures comprising (i) the presence of recipes with the primary agent for performing the action and also the presence of agents for contracting out the action; (ii) the presence of recipes with the primary agent and the absence of agents for contracting; (iii) the presence of agents for contracting and the absence of recipes with the primary agent; and (iv) the absence of both agents and recipes; and presenting a report of the complexity measures associated with performing the task.

The Hadad article does not define the complexity of the actions. More specifically, the Hadad article does not define the complexity of the actions by (i) the presence of recipes with the primary agent for performing the action and also the presence of agents for contracting out the action; (ii) the presence of recipes with the primary agent and the absence of agents for contracting; (iii) the presence of agents for contracting and the absence of recipes with the primary agent; and (iv) the absence of both agents and recipes.

The Examiner notes in his Response to Arguments that the Hadad article provides examples of reports such as a topology tree illustrated in Figure 2 of the Hadad article and pseudo codes illustrated in Figure 3 of the Hadad article. Hadad does not define the complexity measures in the reports by the four measures set forth above.

III. Summary

In summary, the Hadad article does not teach the method for assessing the relative complexity of different options for performing a task by the computer system as claimed herein. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1 – 8, 10, and 15 – 22 specify patentable subject matter and are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable

reconsideration and allowance of this application. The Examiner is requested to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below if it will advance the prosecution of this case.

In view of the amendments made herein as supported by these foregoing remarks, the Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please contact the undersigned at 315-218-8511.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 11, 2008

By: /Ann M. Knab/
Ann M. Knab
Reg. No. 33,331

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC
One Lincoln Center
Syracuse, New York 13202-8530
(315)218-8511
aknab@bsk.com